

REMARKS:

Claims 1-14 are presented for examination, with claims 11-14 having been amended hereby.

Notice is hereby taken that claims 1-10 are allowed.

In addition, notice is taken that the Examiner has indicated that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this regard, it is noted that claim 12 has been so amended.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is now likewise in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the objection to the drawings because of the informalities discussed by the Examiner.

In this regard, applicant attaches hereto a "Letter With Replacement Drawing Sheets". In this attached "Letter With Replacement Drawing Sheets" the rectangles enclosing the figures on each page, as originally filed, have been removed.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings because of the informalities discussed by the Examiner has been overcome.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,196,679 ("Wong '679").

It is respectfully submitted that applicant does not necessarily concur with the Examiner in the Examiner's analysis of the claims of the present application and the Wong '679 disclosure.

Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, independent claim 14 has been amended hereby to more particularly point out the features of the invention directed to each of the retainers being a block having a substantially square cross-section in a vertical axis and having therein a neck, wherein the block and neck of each of the retainers corresponds to the hole of each of the temples.

It is believed that these claimed features (which could aid, for example, in helping to assure that the first and second frames do not inadvertently rotate relative to one another) are neither shown nor suggested by Wong '679.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C.

102(b) as being anticipated by Wong '679 has been overcome.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,113,234 ("Huang '234").

It is respectfully submitted that applicant does not necessarily concur with the Examiner in the Examiner's analysis of the claims of the present application and the Huang '234 disclosure.

Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, independent claim 13 has been amended hereby to more particularly point out the features of the invention directed to each of the retainers being a hook, such that a space is defined in each hook to receive therein the respective portion of each of the temples and such that each hook attaches over the top of a respective portion of each of the temples.

It is believed that these claimed features (which could aid, for example, in helping to assure that the first frame is securely supported by the temples of the second frame) are neither shown nor suggested by Huang '234.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang '234 has been overcome.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,883,689 ("Chao '689").

It is respectfully submitted that applicant does not necessarily concur with the Examiner in the Examiner's analysis of the claims of the present application and the Chao '689 disclosure.

Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, independent claim 11 has been amended hereby to more particularly point out the features of the invention directed to: (a) each recess extending across substantially an entire width of a respective temple of the second frame from a front part of the temple to a rear part of the temple; and (b) each restricting boss being disposed beyond the rear part of the respective temple when a portion of each of the respective temples is placed into the respective retainer to combine the first pair of eyeglasses and the second pair of eyeglasses.


It is believed that these claimed features (which could aid, for example, in helping to assure that the first frame is securely supported by the temples of the second frame) are neither shown nor suggested by Chao '689.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chao '689 has been overcome.

Finally, it is noted that this Amendment is fully supported by the originally filed application and thus, no new matter has been added. For this reason, the Amendment should be entered.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each objection and rejection raised by the Examiner in the June 17, 2004 Office Action has been overcome and that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
GREENBERG TRAURIG

By: 
Matthew B. Tropper
Registration No. 37,457

Dated: September 14, 2004

Mailing Address:
GREENBERG TRAURIG
885 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
(212) 801-2100
Facsimile: (212) 688-2449